

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 17 and 18, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claims 5 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the amended recitations in the claims is found throughout the Specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Applicants submit claims 1 and 9 have been amended, thereby obviating the objections.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 16, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0028208 to Ellis, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,860 to Gaucher.

Claims 7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0028208 to Ellis, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,860 to Gaucher and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,516 to Clapper.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...transmission means for transmitting the program information stored in the database to one of a plurality of electronic apparatuses using wireless communication, wherein each of the plurality of electronic apparatuses function to record and play programs;

control means for controlling each of the plurality of electronic apparatuses recording and playing function in accordance with received selection information;

determination means for determining whether the selection information indicates information that has been recorded previously by one of the plurality of electronic apparatuses and determining which one of the plurality of apparatuses the information is recorded on, and for designating a point for which to begin playback as a function of the selection information when the determination means determines the information has been recorded previously and determines which one of the apparatuses the information is recorded on...” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Publication No. 2005/0028208 to Ellis, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Ellis”) relates to an interactive TV guide with remote access.

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 6,175,860 to Gaucher (hereinafter, merely “Gaucher”) relates to implementing a wireless/wired computer network in an indoor environment with inherent reliability using a master network box connected to an AC power network and a master computer generates an RF field around the computer, the home, and AC power network .

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Ellis or Gaucher, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that Ellis and Gaucher fail to teach or suggest determination means for determining whether the selection information indicates information that has been recorded previously by one of the plurality of electronic apparatuses and determining which one

of the plurality of apparatuses the information is recorded on. Furthermore, Applicants submit that neither Ellis nor Gaucher teach or suggest designating a point for which to begin playback as a function of the selection information when the determination means determines the information has been recorded previously and determines which one of the apparatuses the information is recorded on, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable. Furthermore, Applicants submit that claims 9, 17, and 18 are also patentable for similar reasons.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800